

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,610	SHARP, JEFFREY W.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alan Diamond	1753	

All Participants:

Status of Application: rejected

(1) Alan Diamond.

(3) _____.

(2) Luke Pedersen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1/21/05, 1/27/05, 3/14/05
A

Time: 10:45 a.m., 10:30 a.m., 10:30 a.m.

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:
claims of record


Prior art documents discussed:
JP 11-340530 (JP '530)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 1/21/05, the Examiner requested that the word "adjacent" at line 3 of claim 2 be changed to "directly contacting" in order to distinguish over JP '530. Applicant disagreed because this would not permit instant claims 9 and 10, which recite a passivating agent on the surface of at least one of the p-type regions and at least one of the n-type regions. On 1/27/05, the Examiner proposed replacing said "adjacent" at line 3 of claim 2 with "sharing common boundaries with" so as to distinguish over JP '530 yet still permit the presence of said passivating agent. Applicant agreed to this change. On 1/27/05, the Examiner further requested that claim 2 recite that the P/N-type wafer is an extruded wafer, and that wherein common boundaries between the P-type regions and the N-type regions represent the compression and deformation experienced during the extrusion. Applicant agreed to the change. On 3/14/2005, the Examiner informed applicant that a reference has been found that is pertinent to claim 2, and that the previous Examiner-proposed amendments would have to be withdrawn. The Examiner said that he would send out a second non-final Office action.